



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,341	01/23/2004	John S. Robotham	3293.1000-009	5762

21005 7590 03/14/2006

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

SAJOUS, WESNER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/764,341

Applicant(s)

ROBOTHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Sajous Wesner

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remark

This communication is responsive to the response filed on December 29, 2005.

Claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., displaying two or more content representations at the same time [page 10, paragraph 1]; applying spatial transforms to non-overlapping regions [paragraph 2 of page] before being displayed; displaying visual overlap in the partitions [paragraph 5, page 10]) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, the arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Regarding the spatial resolution relationship argued by the Applicant at page 15, paragraph 1 of the response, it is noted that since in *Sequeira* a displayable representation of a web page with visual content's description is access to define a distinct displayable representation of another visual content description on a display (as characterized by fig. 6 and col. 5, lines 1-2 and col. 6, lines 6-15), it is obvious that a

spatial resolution relationship between a first and a second displayable representations is contemplated, for one representation logically involves or relates to the other. Thus, Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

As per the Applicant's argument regarding claim 5 (see page 15 of the response), it is noted that since in Sequeira, as depicted by item 660a of fig. 6, a partitioned region is shown to reference two distinct web pages; i.e., items 661 & 662, Sequeira's system does provide representations that share a common visual content. It appears that the Applicant intended to argue that viewing contents of two distinct representations are simultaneously displayed to user (see also paragraph 2 page of Applicant's response); however, such an argument does not reflect the claimed language. Reciting that two displayable representations are related, as defined by the claim, is different than displaying the two representations at the same time. Thus, this argument is not deemed persuasive.

Regarding the arguments reflecting claim 9, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., text based representation of a web page that originally contained both text and non-text data such as images, tables or other non-text content (end of page 15 & end of page 16 of the response) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, the arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a

Art Unit: 2676

patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Re claim 11, it is noted that since the web page display in Sequeira provided for user interaction is in a PC window environment (see fig. 1), it therefore encompasses the display of scrolling text. As such, the Applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive.

Regarding claim 8, it is noted that since in Clifton-Bligh reference a section of the display can be expanded to encompass two regions to give sufficient space for the display of different files (see Clifton-Bligh col. 33, lines 9-10), it is obvious that scaling is performed on pixel of one region to define a pixel on a second region, as claimed. Therefore, the Applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive.

Claims 13-26 are similar to claims 1-12 and thus, the discussions set forth above with respect to claims 1-12 applied herein for claims 13-26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-7, and 9-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sequeria US (6185585).

Considering claim 1, Sequeria discloses at figs. 1-6, discloses a method (e.g., *item 120 of fig. 1*) of displaying visual content (e.g., *Internet contents or web page's bitmap, see col. 2, lines 60-65*) on a client (124, fig. 1) comprises providing (e.g., *via items 122 and 124 of fig. 1*) an input description of visual content (*see item 610 of fig. 6*); generating (*via items 122 and 124*) a first displayable representation from the input description of at least a first portion of the visual content (*see item 620, fig. 6*); generating (*122 and 124*) a second displayable representation (640 or 660 of fig. 6) of at least a second portion of the visual content; defining (e.g., *the client user by activating the cursor on URL 621 or 625 of page 620*) a relationship between the first displayable representation and the second displayable representation (*see col. 5, lines 1-2 and col. 6, lines 6-15*); displaying (620 fig. 6) at least partially the first displayable representation; and displaying (640 or 660, fig. 6) at least partially the second displayable representation in response to a selection from the first displayable representation, the selection corresponding to the relationship between the first displayable representation and the second displayable representation (*see col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 36*).

As per claims 2 and 3, Sequeria discloses the relationship defined between the first displayable representation and the second displayable representation is a spatial resolution relationship that maps at least one coordinate location in the first displayable representation to coordinate location in the second displayable representation (e.g., *by referencing the Anchor URL of one web page to obtain and display the representation of another web page for review by the user. See col. 6, lines 6-18, wherein the coordinate location (or region) in the first displayable representation being mapped to the second displayable representation is achieved when the content of the first page is made displayable on the screen's surface or on other portion of the screen, wherein the coordinate location and/or region represents the portion of the screen or partition section onto which the content of the Anchor URL is displayed*).

As per claim 4, Sequeria discloses the second displayable representation (640) is generated from the input description (630) of at least the second portion of the visual content. See fig. 6.

As per claim 5, Sequeria discloses the second portion (640 or 660) of the visual content includes visual content that is common to the first portion of the visual content. See fig. 6, and col. 6, lines 6-18.

As per claim 6, Sequeria the first displayable representation (620) is a first pixel region and the second displayable representation (640) is a second pixel region, the first pixel region and the second pixel region [inherently] having different spatial resolutions. (Note that since the size of display 620 is depicted to be larger than the size of display 640, see fig. 6, they therefore have different spatial resolutions).

As per claim 7, Sequeria discloses performing (e.g., by clicking on Anchor URL 621 of the first representation) a transform operation on the first pixel region of the first displayable representation to generate the second pixel region of the second displayable representation (640). See fig. 6 and col. 6, lines 6-18.

As per claims 9 and 10, Sequeria discloses the second displayable representation is a text-based representation, wherein the text-based representation is displayed at least partially as an overlay on the first displayable representation. See col. 7, lines 65-67, wherein the displayable representation is construed is herein as the display surface.

As per claim 11, Sequeria inherently discloses the text-based representation (see fig. 6) is displayed as scrolling text. *(Note that since the web page display provided for user interaction is in a PC window environment (see fig. 1), it therefore encompasses the display of scrolling text).*

As per claim 12, Sequeria inherently discloses the first displayable representation is generated based on a display attribute of the client. *(It is noted that since the data so processed is displayed in the monitor of a client computer, see col. 6, lines 19-21, the displayable representation (620) is therefore generated based on a display attribute of the client, otherwise the client would not be able to display the representation).*

The invention of claim 13 contains features that are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 1. This being the case, claim 13 is therefore rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim 14 is analogous to the limitations recited in claim 2; it is, therefore, rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

Claim 15 is analogous to the limitations recited in claim 3; it is, therefore, rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per claim 16, Sequeria discloses at one of the displayable representations (620 or 640 or 660) is a pixel region. See fig. 6 and col. 6, lines 6-18.

17. The method of claim 13 wherein at least one of the displayable representations (620 or 640 or 660) is a text-based representation. See fig. 6. See col. 7, lines 65-67.

Claim 18 contains features that are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 6. This being the case, claim 18 is therefore rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

The invention of claim 19 contains features that are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 1. This being the case, claim 19 is therefore rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected for the same reason as claims 2 and 3.

As per claim 22, Sequeria discloses a rendering module (122, fig. 1) that generates at least the first display representation from the input description of the visual content. See col. 6, lines 30-31.

Claim 23 is rejected for reason similar to claim 5.

Claim 24 contains the limitations of claims 6 and 7. Claim 24 is therefore rejected under the same rationale as claims 6 and 7.

Claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

The invention of claim 26 contains features that are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 19. This being the case, claim 26 is therefore rejected under the same rationale as claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeria in view of Clifton-Bligh (US 6775659).

As per claim 8, Sequeria fails to teach performing a transform operation on the first pixel region of the first displayable representation to generate the second pixel region of the second displayable representation by a scaling operation on the first pixel region to generate the second pixel region.

Clifton-Bligh discloses performing a transform operation on the first pixel region of the first displayable representation to generate the second pixel region of the second displayable representation by a scaling operation. See abstract, col. 8, lines 30-41 and col. 32, lines 40-55.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the features of Sequeria to include the scaling of

Art Unit: 2676

display region in the same conventional manner as taught by Clifton-Bligh's col. 32, so that the user can see at a glance that there are different data files that are represented by the areas (see lines 56-62 of col. 32).

Conclusion.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajous Wesner whose telephone number is 571-272-7791. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays thru Fridays between 11:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2676

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tung Kee can be reached on 571-272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wesner Sajous -WS-

3/7/06

Kee M. Tung
Primary Examiner